

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 7 – 12, 14 – 17, 20, 23 – 26, 28, 29, and 31 - 39 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification to overcome the objection to the drawings. The title has been amended per the Examiner's request. By this paper, Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 13, 18, 19, 21, 22, 27, and 30 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, Claims 1, 4, 7 – 12, 15 – 17, 20, 23 – 26, 28, and 29 are amended, and Claims 31 – 39 have been added. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, and no new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. The Examiner's attention is directed to the amended paragraph [0039] of the specification, where a minor correction has been made to a reference numeral. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is thus respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103 AND ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bastian et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,712). Claims 1 – 4 and 17 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundberg (U.S. Pat. No. 6,760,757) in view of Mamakos (RFC 2516). Claims 5 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundberg (U.S. Pat. No. 6,760,757) in view of Mamakos (RFC 2516) and in further view of Bastian et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,712). Claims 9 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundberg (U.S. Pat. No. 6,760,757) in view of Mamakos (RFC 2516) and in further view of Bastian et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,712) and Kent & Atkinson (RFC 2401). Claims 10 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bastian et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,712) in view of Rekhter et al. (RFC 1918). Claims 11 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bastian et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,712) in view of Rekhter et al. (RFC 1918) and in further view of Mamakos (RFC 2516). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that Claims 14 – 16 are allowed and that Claims 6 – 8, 12, 13, 22 – 24, 29, and 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 17, and 26 to include the limitation of at least one of the claims the Examiner has indicated as containing allowable subject matter and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 1, 10, 14, 17, and 26 should now be in condition for allowance.

#### **NEW CLAIMS**

New Claim 31 has been added, which is believed to also define over the cited references. This claim recites “[a] communications system for providing broadband access to passengers of mobile platforms, comprising: a router located on said mobile platform; a network connected to said router... and a first address manager connected

to said ground station that leases use of public Internet Protocol (IP) addresses by said mobile platform, said router including a second address manager enabling communication with said first address manager to lease public IP addresses for said mobile platform.”


The prior art of record neither discloses nor suggests the claimed subject matter. Neither Bastian, Lundberg, Mamakos, Kent & Atkinson, nor Rekhter, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a second address manager that enables communication with a first address manager to lease public IP addresses for a mobile platform. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 31 is in condition for allowance. Further, Claims 32 and 33 depend from Claim 31, and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons cited above.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec. 14, 2005

By:   
Mark D. Elchuk  
Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDE/SDO